



**FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES
May 22, 2002**

Chairman Patel called the monthly meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board to order at 2:07 p.m. on Wednesday, May 22, 2002.

Board Members Present: Hemant Patel, Chairman; Scott Ward, Vice Chair; Shirley Long, Secretary; Ray Acuña (for Tom Callow), Ex Officio; Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio.

Board Members Absent: Melvin Martin; Mike Saager.

Staff Members Present: Mike Ellegood, Chief Engineer and General Manager; Julie Lemmon, General Counsel; Tom Johnson, Deputy Chief Engineer; Dick Perreault, CIP/Policy Branch Manager; Tim Phillips, Area Planning Manager; Todd Williams, Water Quality Branch Manager; Kathy Smith, Clerk of the FCAB; Anne Van Note, Administrative Coordinator.

Guests Present: Hernan Aristizabal, Entellus; Roger Baele, David Evans & Assoc.; Robin Bain, PBS&J; Charlene Carpenter, City of Phoenix; Jeannette Fish, MCFB; Teri George, DEA; L. Steve Miller, PEC; Tim Morrison, HDR Engineering; Hasan Mushtaq, City of Phoenix; Daryl Racz, MCDOT; Rebecca Timmer, Dibble & Assoc.

1) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 24, 2002

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cherrington and seconded by Ms. Long to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

2) LAVEEN AREA CONVEYANCE CHANNEL – POWERLINE EASEMENT IGA

Tim Phillips, Area Planning Manager, presented IGA FCD 2002A006 for the Laveen Area Conveyance Channel (LACC) within the existing Salt River Project controlled easement. The purpose for the IGA is to allow joint use of the SRP Transmission Line easement for the Laveen Area Conveyance Channel

.

The District's sole obligation in this agreement is to submit the plans for approval prior to the channel construction. The 90% plans are currently under review. The District will ultimately require SRP's approval of the 100% plans, as well as from the City of Phoenix and MCDOT for

the channel construction. The City is responsible to submit to SRP for their approval any plans for landscaping or aesthetics that are done after the channel is constructed. There is no cost for the use of the easement, so there are no dollar provisions specifically identified within this agreement.

Discussion:

Patel: This makes a lot of sense. Have we done this before, combine flood control with a power easement?

(Tim asked Mr. Perreault to address the question.)

Perreault: About 15 years ago we had a project in East Mesa where we put in a drainage facility underneath a power line.

Phillips: I also recall that the Old Cross-Cut Canal had a power line that has since been taken out, but when it was built there was a power line corridor associated with that.

Acuña: I understand that some of the information we have received from SRP is relatively new. One of the things I want to be sure of is that we've had an opportunity for the legal staff at the City to review it. I don't see any fatal flaws here, but as far as approval, could we set this up so that if there are substantial changes after we've done the review that we could come back and revisit this IGA.

Phillips: Absolutely, it is still under draft format. Certainly if there were substantial changes between the three parties involved, I would bring it back to the Advisory Board on that basis.

Acuña: I move we support this agreement with that consideration.

Ward: How does SRP feel about the project?

Cherrington: I think the reason that Mr. Acuña asked the question is that there are still some minor issues that our power folks still have and are negotiating to resolve with the City of Phoenix and with the Flood Control District. Even though it sounds like a great idea to incorporate flood control channels underneath power lines, I wouldn't look for that as the future location for all flood control projects because it is not easy to put that kind of facility under a power line. It has to be maintained and there are lots of risks to flooding of some major power lines to the valley.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Acuña and seconded by Ms. Long to approve staff recommendations with the condition that if there are substantial changes it would be brought back to the Advisory Board for further discussion and a decision at that time. The motion carried unanimously.

Further Discussion:

Ward: Is it appropriate, Mr. Chairman, to have a joint presentation from Phoenix, SRP, and the Flood Control District. What Mr. Cherrington said about if you take a power line easement and put a retention basin under it or in the middle of a floodway, you have all sorts of issues to deal with. I'd be interested in seeing how all that works.

Patel: In this particular case, it's also a conveyance facility rather than a storage facility.

Ellegood: If it's the will of the Board that we have a joint presentation, we can do that. It may be worthwhile in this case. The way these things typically work is it's a negotiated process. You sit down in a room, try to hammer out the agreement, typically the attorneys get involved and stir it up a little bit, so you go back and redo it again. It takes about five times longer than anybody would like to get it done, but it gets done.

Patel: To understand what you mean, Scott, we're not talking about holding up this particular approval but as an information item to get a better understanding of how it does work?

Ward: Yes.

Phillips: We'd be happy to put together a presentation that says how we have worked with SRP on both the water and power sides and the O&M issues that the City has and talk about how this project has gone through this process to get to this point. Essentially, we have had, as Mr.

Ellegood indicated, endless negotiations about the details of how all the interests of the respective parties are held, understanding the collective vision and collective benefit that the project gives.

Patel: I think it would be interesting to see what all you deal with. It may influence future requests by the Board of locating flood control facilities under power lines.

Ward: I'd be very interested in both the design and implementation that went into this and the politics behind it. Seeing the entity of Phoenix, SRP, and Maricopa County working together is great. I'm always an advocate of teamwork and anything that can help save money and cost. You've got a lot of strong personalities and a lot of different agendas, and if you could do this, it would be very worthwhile for me to see. It would also be very important to send this message to the County Board of Supervisors and say, "hey guys, SRP, the City of Phoenix, and the Flood Control District all work together to save money."

Patel: That's a good twist on it, where we acknowledge the success.

Ellegood: If it's the Board's wish, I suggest that at the June Advisory Board meeting we bring as an information item, City of Phoenix, Salt River Project and ourselves and make a brief presentation about how we put this project together and how it worked. In response to Mr. Acuña's motion, if there are substantial changes, we should have them flushed out at that time and can then present them as an action item.

Phillips: Because I've been involved in the project from day one, and I am not going to be here in June, I request that we do this at the August meeting. I've probably got the most knowledge of the bits and pieces; I'd like to be the party to present the District's perspective.

Cherrington: In Tim's defense, I'd like to make a statement. We at SRP, and I'm sure the City of Phoenix, have often been characterized by people as being the 8,000 pound gorillas in the valley and what many of the members of the Board haven't seen behind the scenes is the wrestling between those 8,000 pound gorillas and the Flood Control District on these issues. I'd like to compliment Tim on orchestrating that wrestling match because it has not been an easy process. I'm impressed with where we are.

3) FCD STRATEGIC PLAN FY 2002/2003 RESOLUTION

Mr. Ellegood asked that the Board give careful consideration to this item and that there be an appropriate level of discussion, if warranted. Mr. Ellegood mentioned that he has been at the District now for five years. He came in and shortly formed a vision of where he wanted to take the District. Consensus was given from the management team and with the support of the Advisory Board to make an appropriate change in direction. Mr. Ellegood felt it was time to take a look at where the District has been and where the District is going. He asked Tim Phillips to take a look at this, work collaboratively with other members of the management team and other resources within the District and see if he could put together an outline of a strategic plan for the District. Mr. Ellegood identified several items he felt needed either to continue or be emphasized in the future.

Mr. Ellegood identified the Short-Term Priority Issues: Financial Reform/Managing for Results; Management by Watershed; Structures Assessment; Multi-use Facilities; Public Education; and Clean Water. The Long Term Issues include: Aging Workforce; Relations with FEMA; and Climatic Changes. Once Mr. Ellegood gave these issues to Tim, he developed the plan collaboratively with other members of the staff.

Tim Phillips summarized the issues, how the District got there and some of the conclusions reached. Mr. Phillips indicated that the intent of the Plan is to outline the challenges facing the District and provide for the execution of measures to meet those challenges. The strategic objective for the District is how to balance the tools and resources – being financial, human, asset – any of the resources to maximize public protection and minimize risk from stormwater events. Within the District's Mission Statement, there are four fundamentals: Flood Hazard Remediation

(which is the Capital Improvement aspect); Flood Hazard Regulations; Flood Hazard Identification; and Flood Hazard Education. In order to be able to conduct these four fundamentals, there are three implied tasks that must be accomplished: Customer Service; Employee Development; and Financial/Asset Management.

Discussion:

Patel: What is the intent in terms of updating the Strategic Plan, is this an annual exercise you are going to go through?

Ellegood: The intent was to spend enough time in looking at ourselves, where we are and where we're going, and to be able to outline some objectives for the next year. Tim has outlined short-term objectives and what this then suggests is that periodically throughout the year and certainly by next year, we take a look and say, "okay, we set out trying to do "XYZ," how much did we do and how come we didn't do the whole thing?" It would be part of a business plan at least for next year and certainly I would enjoy the opportunity to bring it back to the Board so that you could then measure what we've done. I think this is important to any organization's operation, particularly those in the public sector. When I was in the private sector, you would measure your report card by simply looking at how much money you made and what your backlog was. We don't have that in the public sector, the backlog is there and it never goes away. I might also add that the report card that FEMA provides, the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), is a real good definitive measure of how well we are doing as an agency compared to other agencies across the nation. There are certain things we want to do here that aren't included, for example, they are not interested in providing recreational facilities or mitigation or some of the other stuff that we think we need to be doing, so we have to add to that.

Patel: This is a great organization tool and I'm glad to see you using it in the public sector. Certainly it works very well in the private sector and there is no reason why it shouldn't for the District.

Ward: I really applaud you, Mike, for taking that type of view and it's something that should be presented to the Board of Supervisors, in really looking at a barometer of what your agency does and how successful they are and how important they are to the growth of the County.

Ellegood: Thank you for that observation. Typically we have about one work session with the Board of Supervisors every year. Sometimes getting stuff up there and getting them to sit down and listen is a little difficult because there are other priorities that come up. Issues come up that are more immediate than this sort of long-term general kind of thing. We really don't have an opportunity to regularly interface with them as we do with this Board. Whether we can get this put on an agenda and listened to and discussed anytime in the near future is problematic. I certainly feel that we do need something to provide some direction for us in the future. I think Tim has done a great job; he's certainly been a tremendous resource to me in being able to help us sit down and think through a lot of these things. I would ask that you endorse it.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Acuña and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

Further Discussion:

Ward: Is now the proper time for me to get an update on what's going on with Chandler at Queen Creek and McQueen, or should I ask that later in the meeting.

Phillips: The Board of Directors approved the IGA for Chandler.

Ward: So the joint venture with Chandler has been approved?

Phillips: It's been approved and we've made an offer on the land. We differ in what we think the market value of the land is, and we're determining what the next step should be. Chandler is aligned with us whether we have to go to condemnation to get it or whether we can come to a suitable purchase price.

Ward: When is the timing on that, when do you think that is going to come to a resolution?

Phillips: Our Lands Division has made the offer, we're assessing the owner's response to us, so we have to go back with what that response is, whether we can accept the value that they've placed on it or what they want for the property or whether we have to go through condemnation to secure the property.

Ward: If you come to an agreement on price, when do you start the improvements?

Phillips: That is undefined as yet. The IGA was strictly for the land acquisition part of it.

4) PROPOSAL TO ASSIMILATE ELEMENTS OF THE REGULATORY DIVISION INTO THE COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Mike Ellegood advised the Board that about two weeks ago he received a phone call from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) suggesting that it had been proposed by the head of the Planning & Development Department within the County to assimilate into Planning & Development all of the Regulatory functions of the Flood Control District. Mr. Ellegood indicated that the District would review the proposal and get back to them. In the process of reviewing the proposal, District staff was reminded by the County Attorney that the authority of the County and the District to regulate what goes on in a particular floodplain comes under two Titles in the Arizona Revised Statutes. Title 48 is specific towards flood control districts, providing districts with specific authorities and mandates. Title 11 provides certain authorities to cities and municipalities. Years ago, the District provided drainage inspection and drainage review for unincorporated parts of Maricopa County and the District was reimbursed for the time and efforts in that regard. In 1983, the District entered into an IGA with Maricopa County that stated that the District would provide these services to the County basically free of charge. The District would absorb costs to provide them internally. At first it seemed like a pretty good idea, there would be less out of pocket costs to the District. After taking a closer look at it, District staff felt that there were four reasons why the District needed to retain the drainage inspection and the floodplain management activities within the Flood Control District. The first, and probably most important, is for the past several years the District has been pursuing a process of holistic floodplain management. For example, the District would look at a particular floodplain or watershed and determine where the hazards were. Once that determination was made, the District would come up with a strategy tailored to each watershed to deal with that flooding. In some cases, this meant not to construct in the flood hazard area, in other cases the District would develop regulations that state, "If you are going to develop here, this is what you have to do in order to stay safe." Once the regulations are put in place, there must be some means of checking to make sure the regulations are being followed. Drainage inspection then becomes an integral part of the District's strategy for managing flood hazard areas. The third element of the strategy is simply that if the District can't regulate, some kind of a CIP will need to be developed.

Mr. Ellegood said that the second overarching reason is that the District has an opportunity to develop public/private partnerships. The District is now working hand-in-hand with Planning & Development and the development community. The District can say to the developer, "if you are going to build here, do this; build this channel but let's make it big enough," so then it becomes part of a regional system.

The third reason is the way the District read and interpreted the Arizona Revised Statutes, "In areas of Maricopa County that are not delineated, it is our responsibility to identify whether or not a flood hazard exists if an individual wants to develop in any of these undelineated areas."

The fourth compelling reason is the Community Rating System (CRS). The District just received its annual report card from the National Flood Insurance Program, which is part of the FEMA Program, giving an evaluation of flood control agencies and communities throughout the nation. The District did very well. The Flood Control District is now in the top one percent of

municipalities around the country in providing flood protection. Property owners that live in unincorporated parts of Maricopa County now receive a 25% decrease in the cost of flood hazard insurance. The District is the highest rated in the County; the next highest is the City of Phoenix. A great number of the activities that are rated by the CRS are regulatory functions and how well the District administers drainage inspection and drainage activity. Without having that opportunity, the District would be in jeopardy of losing that rating.

Discussion

Patel: I agree that there are compelling reasons for it to stay where it's at and hopefully you will succeed in maintaining it.

Ellegood: We hope so. The Office of Management and Budget will probably be reviewing this in the near future. Because there is an IGA involved, if we want to change anything we'll have to take it to the Board of Supervisors. I would like to take this recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, should this come up as an agenda item.

ACTION: It was moved by Ms. Long and seconded by Mr. Acuña to approve staff recommendations. The motion carried unanimously.

5) STORMWATER QUALITY ISSUES IN MARICOPA COUNTY

Todd Williams, Water Quality Branch Manager, presented some of the stormwater quality issues the District must deal with as a result of the Clean Water Act Stormwater Regulations.

The District is a Regional Stormwater Management Agency. Part of that mandate is that the District's mission is to reduce the flood risk for the people of Maricopa County, which we do by providing flood and stormwater management services.

Goals of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program are to: 1) Reduce the discharge of pollutants to the "Maximum Extent Practicable;" 2) Protect water quality; and 3) Satisfy the appropriate water quality requirements of the Clean Water Act.

Discussion

Patel: Todd, I commend you on the progress you have made on what is obviously going to be a very complex issue and a fairly major factor in the work that the District does. Mike, I'd be interested in seeing some kind of an estimate of the impact of this program on our fiscal situation. We obviously have resources committed to it and there is a lot of regulatory activity that's going to have to happen even if it's somewhere down the road. We're going to have to start working that in to our long-term planning and take money away from the CIP or be looking at new fees. I want to be sure that as soon as possible, we start identifying these numbers and updating them and warning everybody around there that this is coming and we are going to be looking for more money, whether it's through levy's or through fees. I'm thinking this probably lends itself to some kind of fee structure to recoup the cost rather than taking it out of our fixed budget.

Ellegood: Thank you for your comments and you're right. Our project control system will allow us to tell you what it has cost us out of pocket. I think a broader question is what it is costing the public. When, for example, a developer goes in and tries to do something, he then has to apply for a permit and what does it cost to comply with that permit. This past year, we have identified with the Office of Management and Budget one additional position for Todd to continue to implement this effort and apply for this permit by March of 2003. We don't know yet if this request will be granted. We have indicated to them, since this is a very difficult budget year for the County, etc., that we would absorb that within our existing CIP budget. Sooner or later we are not going to meet our commitments to our municipal clients and that's going to fall behind and that will be a crisis in the future, but at the moment we can absorb it.

Patel: I'm hoping that this Board can help if we created some tool, whether it's a position paper, something that we can formally approve that identifies what this program is going to take to implement our obligations that we have as a district. If we say that right now we know it's going to take three positions and five inspectors at a total cost of whatever. I'd like to put it out there that starting sometime in 2003, we're going to have to start levying fees or fines to recoup these costs or somebody is going to have to write us a check from downtown. We're not going into this blind because otherwise the CIP will suffer.

Cherrington: I'm curious about the Waters of the U.S. You said you take the EPA's definition of the Waters of the U.S., so I'm assuming that most of your conveyance facilities are Waters of the U.S.? And, if these are Waters of the U.S., why do you need a permit at all? It's people who discharge into Waters of the U.S. who need the permit. It seems like you're patrolling and being the regulatory agency for discharges into the Waters of the U.S., which is the EPA's job. Why are you doing it at all?

Williams: To address your question, that's what we are doing right now to essentially protect our interests until we get a definitive answer or direction. You are correct that technically the EPA is the one that is going to have to regulate that. Although the program has been under Federal direction since its inception here in Arizona, the State of Arizona has also had an individual who is actually the one that writes the permits, yet it's EPA of San Francisco that actually signs off on things. We do know that the individual here in Arizona believes that's the case – they are considered Waters of the U.S. Whether senior management over there agree with that, that's unclear right now. Until we really know what's going to happen with the State's primacy effort, I don't think we're going to know how we are going to do that. For example, there is a water treatment plant where they want to have the capability to discharge to the ACDC. The way the regulation is written, we don't feel we can grant them that authority. Right now we are denying it until there is some clear direction from these regulators. That's where I say EPA San Francisco and ADEQ are going to have to get their act together and figure out if what they are saying is the same as headquarters in Washington. At many of these NAFSMA meetings, we do have the capability to bend the ear of Michael Cook who is head of the EPA's Water Program, but sometimes our messages aren't necessarily getting to the regional offices.

Cherrington: Do you deem the ACDC to be Waters of the U.S.?

Williams: Perhaps Ms. Lemmon can answer that question.

Lemmon: One of the problems is that we have not had anybody tell us what our structures are. Until we apply for our permit and go through the process of mapping the system, we aren't going to have the final say as to whether that particular structure is a Water of the U.S. or not. We suspect, if you look at the law, that the ACDC from where it picks up Cave Creek, which is a Water of the U.S., will be deemed to be a Water of the U.S., and therefore we won't have to have a permit to discharge at the outlet into Skunk Creek, which is a Water of the U.S. We also have indications from ADEQ that they believe that the ACDC at the outlet near Skunk Creek is a Water of the U.S. from some other things that have happened out there where other permits have been required for discharges. There really isn't a final determination, and until we get a final determination similar to what you at SRP got for your canals, we can't say absolutely, "yes, you have to have a NPDES Permit to discharge," "no, you don't – we are under another phase of the program." Until we get that kind of determination, we're not sure what we are and it gives us a lot of problems on how to deal with the cities that are discharging into us. I'm not trying to make that more difficult than it sounds, but we really don't have a final determination where EPA has said, "this is a Water of the U.S. and this is not." All of them are potentially Waters of the U.S. under the Tributary Rule. We just need to get a determination.

Cherrington: Is it not possible then, if they are determined to be Waters of the U.S. (and I'm curious if you ask them), are we, the Flood Control District, spending lots of money monitoring and doing regulatory things that we don't need to be doing, they need to be doing? We're spending money that we don't need to spend.

Lemmon: Once they are determined to be a Water of the U.S., then that assumption that we don't have to worry about some of the discharge is correct. The problem is that if they determine that it is not a Water of the U.S., that it's all totally a man-made channel that never existed before, and if we are not careful now about what we allow to be discharged into it, we may find ourselves trying to build the biggest detention basin in the world at the outlet to clean it up at some future time. Until we have a determination, we are trying to take the best fiscally responsible approach to not letting a lot of pollutants be discharged into our facilities until we know what our situation is.

Acuña: I'd like to share some information along those lines. I think your comments are on target. I've got the NPDES group in my division with the City of Phoenix and I wrestle with their mission. There is no doubt that protecting the environment is good public practice, that's unquestionable. It's how we carry that out that I'm wrestling with. I ask very simple questions of the staff and some of the questions I ask are, "what value do you think you bring?" Typically, my NPDES staff (they're good people) have a regulatory mentality and their answer is, "if you don't do this you are going to get a notice of violation." That's fine, but I still want to understand what the value is. At some point in time, like all programs that take on a life of their own, you need more regulator strength or more equipment to do a better job. It seems to me like it's a program, of course it's a mandated program, but it's hard for me to wrap my arms around the value and it's going to be even harder to determine how much more resources we want to apply to it. There's no doubt in my mind that there are pollutants getting into the rainwater. This is a city and there are things here that we use in the course of human activity that ultimately get into the stormwater. If the goal is ultimately to treat all stormwater, maybe that's what we do. Right now, we are just kind of peppering it with monies that come from our CIP Programs. To me, that's where you get the biggest bang for your buck. When people flood and you go out and build something, they see value. When you start peppering, and you don't really get a big bang for your buck, at some point you're not meeting your primary mission. I'm uncomfortable with that myself. It's not that the work is not valuable, I think collectively it's time to refocus and say, "what are we getting for our money," and it is really something that we really want to maybe not challenge, but get better answers from folks who are saying, "look, do this or you're going to get a notice of violation." That in and of itself is not a good enough reason to continue to pepper money into these things.

Ellegood: Certainly your thoughts are very parallel to my own. If we were to agree that we need to spend a certain percentage of our budget on clean water and clean water issues, in my opinion, we could spend it a lot better on more effective programs than the one that has been mandated by the Federal Government. It was produced by folks in an area where it rains and it really doesn't apply to us, it just doesn't work very well. We have crews on standby during the monsoon season and when it rains, we try to send these guys out in the middle of the desert someplace to catch a water sample. Often times by the time they get there it's over with and the water is gone and it's a waste of time & money. The only way we can fix that is through organizations like NAFSMA, and make our voice heard that it doesn't work here. Your regulator is absolutely right. If you don't do it, you get a notice of violation and potentially you'll be jeopardizing Federal resources for highway projects and other kinds of things.

Lemmon: I wanted to add one item about the Waters of the U.S. The District struggles somewhat with whether we want to have all the structures declared Waters of the U.S. because that may, in fact, trigger the Corps of Engineers involvement in our future maintenance and operation. We've had some struggles with that in the past, so it becomes a policy issue as to whether you want to take advantage of it, if there is an advantage to being a Water of the U.S.

ACTION: No action was required – for information and discussion only.

6) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Mike Ellegood was pleased to announce that, subsequent to the meeting of the Drainage Review Board regarding Bonita Dam, the District did meet with ADWR. He believes that some things will be worked out jointly to resolve the issue. The District believes very strongly that the solution is to have DWR remove the dam. When that is done, it will create a flood hazard area for some properties that are downstream of it, so the District will need to figure out how to address that issue. The District's Engineering Division is currently in the process of mapping that flood hazard area that would result from the removal of the dam, and will take it from there.

Mr. Ellegood mentioned that over the past several months he was invited to attend several breakfast meetings of the Farm Bureau in each of the Supervisory districts to answer several questions of concerns to the farm constituency in the County. The concerns they had were the District's delineation program, which is a mandated program. They are concerned about the impacts of delineation on property values. They need to be concerned about it, but under the current Statutes, there is not much that can be done or should be done. They are concerned too that apparently many of them have not received proper notification that studies have been going on. Mr. Ellegood outlined for them the District's program in terms of notification and he agreed to try to step up those efforts to do an even better job than has been done in the past. Finally, several members were concerned about the District wanting to work partnerships with property owners to reduce the flood hazard, and Laveen was the case-in-point. They were a little concerned about the future there and does that constitute some sort of extortion. Mr. Ellegood thinks he was able to assure them that it was voluntary but that the District felt that it was in the combined best interest of everyone that we work a partnership out.

Mr. Ellegood said that for the past three days, he was privileged to participate in Arizona Town Hall. It's a gathering of about 150 plus leaders and representatives from around the State – public, private, government, newspaper – to talk about an issue of importance to the State as a whole. The last three days they talked about the subject of developing leadership in the State of Arizona. Mr. Ellegood recommended that should anyone have the opportunity to participate in a Town Hall, it's a good, intense and invaluable experience. You have an opportunity to interface with leaders from around the State and get a perspective that is outside of your own.

7) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS

Actions of the Board of Supervisors were included in the FCAB packet.

8) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There was no other business or comments from the public.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m. by general consent.

Shirley Long
Secretary of the Board

Kathy Smith
Clerk of the Board